

The Honorable John H. Chun

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-0932-JHC

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO FILE RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF
SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY
RELATING TO DEFENDANTS'
MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
Friday, March 22, 2024

Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") respectfully requests leave to file the attached proposed Response (the "Response") to Defendants' Notice of Supplemental Authority (Dkt. #149; the "Notice"). In support of its motion, the FTC states as follows:

1. On March 1, 2024, Defendants filed the Notice, which described and attached Judge Martinez's decision granting in part and denying in part Amazon's motion to dismiss in *Daly, et al. v. Amazon.com, Inc., et al.*, No. 22-cv-00910-RAJ (W.D. Wash.).

2. Local Civil Rule 7(n) permits the filing of notices of supplemental authority, but neither permits nor prohibits the filing of responses to such notices. Whether to permit the FTC

1 to file its Response is therefore a matter committed to the Court’s “sound discretion.” *See, e.g.,*
 2 *C&R Forestry, Inc. v. Consol. Hum. Res., AZ, Inc.*, 2007 WL 914198, at *3 (D. Idaho Mar. 23,
 3 2007) (“A decision to grant or deny a party’s motion to supplement their briefings is committed
 4 to the sound discretion of the court.”) (citing *SEC v. Seaboard Corp.*, 677 F.2d 1301, 1314 (9th
 5 Cir. 1982)).

6 3. Here, permitting the Response’s filing is appropriate because the Response is
 7 necessary to address two material omissions in Defendants’ Notice. Specifically, as described in
 8 more detail in the attached Response, Defendants’ Notice omits that (1) Judge Martinez allowed
 9 the *Daly* plaintiffs’ state-law challenges to Amazon *cancellation* practices (across multiple
 10 subscription services, including Prime) to proceed (Dkt. #149 at 19-20), and (2) that what
 11 Defendants label the “challenged Amazon Prime enrollment process” (Dkt. #149 at 1)—which
 12 Judge Martinez found not to violate to the Oregon and Washington auto-renewal laws—was the
 13 enrollment process challenged in *Daly*, which is different from the enrollment processes
 14 challenged by the FTC.

15 **LOCAL RULE 7(e) CERTIFICATION**

16 I certify that this memorandum contains 283 words, in compliance with the Local Civil
 17 Rules.

1 Dated: March 4, 2024

/s/ Evan Mendelson

2 EVAN MENDELSON (DC Bar #996765)

3 OLIVIA JERJIAN (DC Bar #1034299)

4 THOMAS MAXWELL NARDINI

(IL Bar # 6330190)

5 Federal Trade Commission

600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington DC 20580

(202) 326-3320; emendelson@ftc.gov (Mendelson)

(202) 326-2749; ojerjian@ftc.gov (Jerjian)

(202) 326-2812; tnardini@ftc.gov (Nardini)

8 COLIN D. A. MACDONALD (WSBA # 55243)

9 Federal Trade Commission

915 Second Ave., Suite 2896

Seattle, WA 98174

(206) 220-4474; cmacdonald@ftc.gov (MacDonald)

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION